

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA**

IN THE MATTER OF PROHIBITING <u>ANTHONY CAMBONI</u> FROM FILING ANY LAWSUIT IN MARICOPA COUNTY WITHOUT OBTAINING PRIOR PERMISSION FROM THE COURT	}	ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER No. 2018 - 133
--	---	--

This matter was referred by the Honorable James D. Smith to consider issuing an administrative order declaring Anthony Camboni a vexatious litigant. Upon review of other matters filed in this Court and the Federal District Court, and considering all the matters presented, the Court makes the following findings and orders.

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-3201, the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court may designate a pro se litigant who engages in vexatious conduct as a vexatious litigant. In addition, courts “possess inherent authority to curtail a vexatious litigant’s ability to initiate additional lawsuits.” *Madison v. Groseth*, 230 Ariz. 8, 15, 279 P.3d 633, 639 (App. 2012). The filing excesses of vexatious litigants interfere with the orderly administration of justice by diverting judicial resources from those cases filed by litigants willing to follow court rules and those meritorious cases that deserve prompt judicial attention. See *Acker v. CSO Chevira*, 188 Ariz. 252, 934 P.2d 816 (App. 1997). A.R.S. § 12-3201(E) defines vexatious conduct to include repeated filing of court actions solely or primarily for the purpose of harassment as well as bringing court actions without substantial justification.

Mr. Camboni’s history of filing unmeritorious lawsuits is documented in detail in the ruling dated September 7, 2018 and filed on September 11, 2018 in CV 2017-050183. As stated therein, in 2011, Mr. Camboni filed a case in federal court involving the same issues of judicial immunity set forth in CV 2017-050183 (a civil case filed in this Court). Mr. Camboni filed his 2017 case even though the district court had rejected his claims against judicial officers based on judicial immunity. See *Camboni vs. McCain, et al.*, CV2017-050183. See also *Camboni v. Arizona*, 2011 WL 3471056, \*2-3 (D. Ariz. Aug. 8, 2011).

In 2012, in another case filed in the federal court system, the district court dismissed Mr. Camboni’s putative RICO claims. See *Camboni v. MGM Grand Hotel, LLC*, 2012 WL 2915080 (D. Ariz. July 16, 2012). Mr. Camboni based his claims in *MGM Grand Hotel* on his dissatisfaction with the outcome of earlier, separate litigation. The district court also struck portions of Mr. Camboni’s brief that consisted “solely of a lewd, personal attack on Lewis & Roca counsel . . . .” *Id.* at \*7.

In *Camboni v. Allstate Insurance Co.*, No. 1 CA-CV 11-0592, 2012 WL 4571033 (Ariz. Ct. App. Oct. 2, 2012), Mr. Camboni received a continuance to retain counsel but

then requested another continuance a week before oral argument. *Id.* ¶ 6. He also filed several motions that required responses after those defendants had filed their answering briefs. *Id.* ¶ 16. Those motions included requests to suspend rules of civil appellate procedure, a motion to transfer to the Arizona Supreme Court, and a motion to remove the defendants' attorneys. *Id.* After his barrage of motions, a motions panel of Div. 1 of the Arizona Court of Appeals entered an order prohibiting Mr. Camboni from filing additional motions. *Id.*

Mr. Camboni returned to this Court and then the Court of Appeals in *Camboni v. Morrison*, No. 1 CA-CV 12-0725, 2013 WL 6506978 (Ariz. Ct. App. Dec. 10, 2013). According to the Court of Appeals, Mr. Camboni's opening brief was "not based in law" but "a cluster of arguments unrelated" to the relevant rulings. *Id.* ¶ 7. That Court assessed fees against Mr. Camboni under ARCAP 25 "in an effort to discourage him from similar appellate briefs in the future." *Id.* ¶ 14. The Court also awarded fees under A.R.S. § 12-349, explaining, "It is clear that Camboni is using the courts as a manner of harassing Defendants." *Id.* ¶ 15.

Another judicial officer of this Court noted in 2014 that Mr. Camboni "has filed the same allegations against the same Defendants on the same underlying facts." [Under Advisement Ruling (filed September 17, 2014), *Camboni v. MGM Grand Hotel, LLC*, No. CV2014-091593 (Maricopa Cty. Superior Ct.).] The Court explained that Mr. Camboni's claims were the subject of state and federal court actions, both of which ended with judgments against Mr. Camboni.

The Court of Appeals chastised Mr. Camboni in *Camboni v. Brnovich*, No. 1 CA-CV 15-0014, 2016 WL 388933 (Ariz. Ct. App. Feb. 2, 2016). That Court explained that "Camboni's appeal is frivolous and unsupported by any reasonable legal theory." *Id.* ¶ 12.

Mr. Camboni's most recent Arizona state appeal appears to be *Camboni v. Golden Hills HOA*, No. 1 CA-CV 15-0213, WL 6211790 (Ariz. App. Oct. 25, 2016). In that case Mr. Camboni used the title "king, ambassador". *Golden Hills* also involved Mr. Camboni improperly seeking to represent others although he is not a licensed lawyer. The Court noted again that Mr. Camboni's "opening brief sets forth no cognizable legal argument." *Id.* ¶ 11. As stated by the court, "Camboni has not complied with ARCAP, has not raised meritorious legal arguments, and has caused unnecessary motion practice—all of which has needlessly consumed the time of opposing counsel and the court." *Id.* ¶ 13.

In *Camboni v. McCain*, a case filed in this Court (CV 2016-004243), Mr. Camboni challenged John McCain's election to the United State Senate. Among other things, Mr. Camboni alleged that Sen. McCain committed perjury and that, as a Christian, Sen. McCain should concede the election to Mr. Camboni. In his 2017 lawsuit (CV 2017-050183), Mr. Camboni again listed Sen. McCain as a Defendant.

The Ninth Circuit's most recent disposition of an appeal from Mr. Camboni was four sentences and concluded that "the questions raised in this appeal are so insubstantial as not to require further argument." *Camboni v. Brnovich*, 2017 WL 4182114 (9th Cir. June 14, 2017). In that underlying litigation, Mr. Camboni sued several state officials and agencies. Mr. Camboni brought those claims in part out of dissatisfaction with the outcome in earlier, separate litigation. *Camboni v. Brnovich*, 2016 WL 4271850 (D. Ariz. Aug. 15, 2016).

In *Camboni v. McCain* (CV2017-050183), Mr. Camboni's operative pleading is 88 pages long and often indecipherable. As with many of his prior cases, his "claims" arise out of dissatisfaction with the results in earlier, separate litigation. Mr. Camboni's oppositions to motions to dismiss do not include meritorious arguments -- a recurring theme with his court submissions and are at times incomprehensible.

It is not only the lack of merit to Mr. Camboni's arguments that concerns the Court. Nearly every aspect of his conduct evidences frivolity. For example, Mr. Camboni has insisted on using the title of "king, ambassador". He has knowingly disregarded the notice of claim requirement (according to Mr. Camboni he voluntarily chose not to comply with § 12-821.01 by deciding 'to politely decline opportunity to file a Notice of Claim.')

He purported to represent his wife despite lacking a license to practice law. He referred to his wife in pleadings as his "slave" and "property". At times in his cases he has referred to certain defendants as "slaves" of Maricopa County or the State. He has argued that defendants communicate with the dead and the corpse they claim to represent. In a pleading filed in CV 2017-050183 he attached photographs of Governor Ducey with his family and Attorney General Brnovich with his family. He referred to each man's children and wife as "slaves." He also referred to defense counsel as "slave owners". He filed default applications against defendants who had appeared and moved to dismiss his claims

The Court may issue an order limiting a litigant's ability to file future lawsuits, motions, and requests for relief to the extent necessary to curtail improper conduct such as that exhibited by Mr. Camboni. See A.R.S. §12-3201. The Court finds the orders set out below to be the least restrictive orders that will adequately address Mr. Camboni's vexatious conduct and established pattern of abuse. Therefore,

**IT IS ORDERED** as follows:

1. Mr. Camboni may not file any new causes of action after the date of this order without leave of the Civil Presiding Judge or his/her designee.
2. Any motion for leave to file any lawsuit, pleading or motion shall be captioned "Application Pursuant to Court Order Seeking Leave to File." Mr. Camboni must either cite this order in his application, or attach as an exhibit a copy of this order.

If approval for filing a new action by Mr. Camboni is granted, the Clerk of Court may accept subsequent filings in that cause number from Mr. Camboni.

Dated this 13th day of September, 2018.

/s/ Janet E. Barton

---

Honorable Janet E. Barton  
Presiding Judge

Original: Clerk of the Superior Court

Copies: Hon. Chris DeRose, Clerk of the Superior Court  
Hon. Pamela Gates, Civil Department Presiding Judge  
Hon. James Smith  
Raymond L. Billotte, Judicial Branch Administrator  
Anthony Camboni